APPEAL NO. 021266 FILED JULY 1, 2002

This app	eal aris	ses pursuan	t to the	e Tex	as Wor	kers' C	ompe	ensati	ion Act,	TEX.	LAB.
CODE ANN. §	401.00	1 et seq. (1	989 Ad	ct). A	contes	sted ca	se he	aring	was he	eld on	April
23, 2002. With	h respe	ect to the si	ngle is	sue I	before	her, the	e hea	ring	officer of	determ	ıined
that the app	ellant	(claimant)	did	not	have	disabil	ity,	as i	a resu	t of	her
		compensab	le inju	iry fr	om		_		, to Ja	ınuary	16,
2002, but that	she did	d have disa	bility fr	om .	January	17, 20	002, t	hrou	gh the o	date o	f the
hearing, in acc	cordanc	e with the	parties	' stip	ulation	to tha	t effe	ct.	În her a	ppeal	, the
claimant essen	tially ar	gues that th	ie hear	ing o	fficer's	determ	inatio	n tha	at she di	d not l	have
disability from	_		_, to J	anua	ry 16, 2	2002, is	s aga	inst t	he grea	t weig	ht of
the evidence.	In its	response to	the c	laima	nt's ap	peal, tl	he re	spon	dent (se	elf-insi	ured)
urges affirmand	ce.	-				-		-	·		,

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant did not have disability for the period from ________, to January 16, 2002. That issue presented a question of fact for the hearing officer. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93613, decided August 24, 1993. Section 410.165(a) provides that the hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence. As the fact finder, the hearing officer resolves the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence and determines what facts the evidence has established. Garza v. Commercial Ins. Co., 508 S.W.2d 701 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). The hearing officer was acting within her province as the finder of fact in determining that the claimant did not sustain her burden of proving disability during the period at issue. Nothing in our review of the record demonstrates that the challenged determination is so against the great weight of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Accordingly, no sound basis exists for us to disturb that determination on appeal. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the self-insured is **(SELF-INSURED)** and address of its registered agent for service of process is

CJ (ADDRESS) (CITY) TEXAS (ZIP CODE).

	Elaine M. Chaney Appeals Judge
CONCUR:	
Daniel R. Barry	
Appeals Judge	
Thomas A. Knapp	
Appeals Judge	